



"Vasige-name" Nadir Shah Afshar as a source for studying relationship currents in Islam in the second half of the XVIII century

Rena Mamedova,

Associate Professor, Ph.D.

in history, leading researcher

Institute of Manuscripts of the National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan

DOI: 10.1353/mlt.2018.866

Abstract

Having come to power in 1736, Nadir Shah Afshar proclaimed the introduction of a new state religion - the teachings of Imam Jafar al-Sadig . H and throughout his reign of Nadir Shah in different ways sought recognition from the Ottoman sultan as the head of the caliphate of the teachings of Islam fifth school: through diplomatic exchanges and military operations against the Ottoman Empire. In 1743, at the initiative of Nadir Shah , an unprecedented meeting of Shiite and Sunni scholars was convened in Najaf , at which proposals for recognition by Sunni scholars of Jafarid Madhab. The participants of the meeting came to a definite agreement by issuing " vasige-name " - The document according to which the Iranian delegation confirmed the ban on the reproach of the first three caliphs and the recognition of their righteousness , and the scientists of Iraq, Central Asia and Afghanistan recognized the sanctity of Imam Jafar al-Sadig .

Keywords: Nadir Shah Afshar , meeting, Najaf , vasige-name , Islam , Shiism, Sunni Islam, Jafarid madhhab ottoman empire.

On Conference, convened in 1736 in the Mugan steppe, leader of the Turkic tribe Afshar Nadir Quli Khan was elected Shah Iran. He agreed to take the throne on the condition that the state of the country would turn into Sunnism, give up the rule imposed by Shah Ismail I abusive for sunnis Shiite practices, and will accept the teachings of the 6th Imam Jafar al-Sadiq as the fifth law school of Islam [4, c. 269; 10, c. 446-49]. In all this, he declared in his speech to the throne: "This madhhab was spread earlier and in Iran (Sunnism- R.M.), and the sovereign, conqueror of the world, Shah Ismail Safavid, ... being guided by the needs of his state, left that (Sunnism- R.M.) madhhab, spread and paved the way for Shi'ism. In addition, ignorant people engaged in "Sabb" [i] and "rafd" [ii], senseless and provocative acts, which poured over the land of Iran with the blood of unrest and vice. As long as these acts continue, this great provocation will not be eliminated among the adherents of Islam. Therefore, it is necessary to abandon this Shiite madhhab, contrary to the faith of our valiant and glorious ancestors. And since Hazrat And Mom Jafar Ben Muhamad al-Baqir (al-Sadiq) (peace be upon him peace!) is the true Imam, let the Iranians recognize him head of his madhhab and follow this excellent on the wagon'am [iii]" [4, c. 269; 10, c. 446-49].

Thus, having come to power, Nadir Shah, like Shah Ismail I (1501-1524), announced the introduction in Iran of a new state religion - the teachings of the 6th Imam Jafar al-Sadiq (699-765), proclaimed their fifth orthodox madhhab Sunnah. The latter, known as the interpreter of Shiite jurisprudence (fiqh), similarly to the four orthodox Sunni schools (Hanafi, Malikit, Shafi'i, Hanbali) founded his own school, "mazhab", after his death, which was called "mazhab-i Jafari (Jafarid mazhab)". His teaching, for the most part, adhered to the methodology of the Hanbali legal school, but unlike the latter, it included the traditions of 12 Shi'ite mothers and their own Hadith [13, p. 95].

Throughout his reign, the Dir sought from the Ottoman sultan as head of the caliphate the recognition of the Jafarid doctrine of the new mazhab of Islam, which meant that the legal beliefs of Imam Jafar al-Sadiq to lzheny considered turkumi-Sunni fundamental work of a new madhhab similar to the writings of the founders of the four Sunni schools. And only after that Jafarid the mazhab could be included in the number of law schools of Sunni Islam, the imam himself Ja'far al-Sadiq - equated to the founders of Sunni schools, and for Shi'ism was not supposed to be the Doctrine of the obstacles to eventually enter in Sunni Islam. However, in the religious

tontseptsii Nadir Shah had one fundamental contradiction to this ka i mamologiia Shiism, from which H Adira should refuse: for if Ja'far al-Sadiq was equated to the founders of schools of law - ie Abu Hanifah or al-Sha'fii and found one of the drafters of furu'at, then "would deny the function of the 12 imams as the only legitimate custodians and interpreters of transmitting esoteric dimension of Islam" [1, c. 292; 11, c. 77]. And the rejection of imamology, according to the fair definition of H. Algar, would have transformed Jafari dsky m azhab into the "non-viable hybrid of truncated Shiism integrated into the Unni Current and the Slam" [1, p. 291].

Throughout his reign Nadir, maintaining relations with the Ottoman government through the exchange of embassies and aggressively sought from the Porte-madhab and recognition Jafari, but every time in response received a refusal and misunderstanding. With the start of the Nadir route to India in 1739 and the Russian-Turkish war of 1735-1739 r. In relations between Iran and Turkey, we were stupid by a relative calm. Returning from India in 1741, Nadir Shah resumed talks with Porto on the issue of the mazhab-i Jafari, trying to define Shiism as a "masjid-i haram. In a letter to Istanbul he threatened war on Turkey in case of a failure with in their demands. But in his reply with ultan Mahmood I (pr. 1730-1754), expressing the hope that hence-

forth "the sword will be sheathed," he said that although adopted instead of shiism in ir ana "mazhab-i Sunnat" and recognized Islamic world as a ve l hiccuping merit, but "Outstanding scientists regard the Maz hub Jaafari as heresy, and for this reason, and in ozderzhivayutsya from its adoption" [3, p. 13].

Upon his return from India, Nadir Shah began a punitive campaign in D'Agestan, but ran into stubborn resistance local Naselle eniya that is passed to claimflowing artisan war organizing ambushes and attacks on the column with supplies [5, p. 159]. And arrival at January 1742 in L Ager Nadir in Darband Ottoman embassy, which included the absence of Ali religious scholars to discuss Dzhafaridsk madhab, displeased Nadir. Fter talks with envoys of the Nadir, demonstrating real Porte at n razdnenie Shi'ism in Iran, once again issued a decree stopping the scorn and denial of the first three caliphs. The decree of religious hatred was again accused by Shah Ismail I, who, spreading Shiism and denying the righteousness of the first three caliphs, sowed among Muslims "denial, heresy and disagreement", which atheists use against Muslims [14, p.52-55; 7, s. 85]. Both countries were hard at war [12, p. 153]: 24 Safar 1155/30 April 1742 the Ottoman Sultan in the event of an attack by Nadir, the Sultan received a fatwa

from Sheikh Uslam on a war with Iran [19, p. 301]. But in a letter received from Sult Ana Dagestan at the end of 1155 / beginning of 1743, was repeated again the impossibility of recognizing and mazhab Jafari and obtaining permission for the construction of the fifth table of the ba Ka'ba for the new mazhab [8, pp.226-27], which was the reason that Nadir decided to strike at the Ottoman Turks in Iraq. Before Sending and eat from Dagestan Nadir invited the ruler of Baghdad, Ahmed Pasha, to hand over the city [Ibid, p.227].

Intruding at 1743 in Iraq, Nadir Shah quickly captured most provinces, besieging Baghdad and Basra, took Kirkuk [12, p. 165; 5, s. 162] and again sent two religious scholars to Istanbul, demanding recognition of their transformations. But, as before, the Turks were adamant: "the adoption of the mazhab-iJafari pyato first school of Islam may lead to discord and conflict within the (Ottoman-RM.)

State "[4, p. 387; 6, s. 561], and the Ottoman Pashazadeh issued another fatwa declaring Shui destruction and taking in n flax Iranians pious deed [12, p. 165]. Then Nadir laid siege to Mosul, which is 40 days works resisted, then after suffering huge losses in the 12 taken by assault, was forced to stop the military operations [12, p. 175] and perform with peace proposals to Ahmed Pasha. According to

Iranian sources, the latter, having received approval from Istanbul about the resumption of negotiations with Iran [4, p. 387, 6, p. 561; 5, 162], also sent his envoy to the camp of Nadir Shah with a proposal for peace, after which in October 1743 the siege of Mosul was filmed [12, p.175].

Being in Iraq, in Shavvale 1156 / November 1743 Nadir Shah made pilgrimage to holy places: not only Shiite - tombs imams Musa Kaz Ima and Mohammed Javad, but also to the mud could Sunni scholar Abu Hanafi [4, p. 387], then having gone through the Hill of Kazimeyna to museum and Mom Ali Abi Talib in Najaf-i Ashraf [4, c. 388].

Continuing to hope to convince the Ottoman court in the reality of their relational transformations in Najaf Nadir Shah decided to convene a meeting of authoritative Sunni and Shiite scholars to discuss their five demands put forward by them in 1736 g of. [4, p. 270; 7, s. 83]. He appealed to the governor of Baghdad, Ahmed yn Ashe asking for an authoritative sous nnitskogo scientist who could come out in the role of a judge between Sunnis and Shiites, the meeting participants. Selection of Ahmad and Pashy fell on one of Iraq's clergy leaders Shafi'i scholar Sheikh Abdullah al-Suwaidi (1692-1760), who, by his own admission, gocamping in Najaf with great

fear and uncertainty about the true intentions of Nadir's [16, p. 6]. Detailed coverage of this meeting can be found in the works of eyewitnesses and participants of the meeting on both sides: Mirza Mehdi Khan Astarabadi in the "Tarigi Nadiri" and in the composition of Sheikh and Abdullah al-Suweidi called "Hugej-i Kat'iyye" ("Final proof").

In his pictorial narrative, full of detailed details, The latter emphasized that on the way to Najaf Nadir, the Shah visited several shrines, including the tomb of the 9th Imam Muhammad al-Jawad.

This gave reason to doubt the smiling Ottoman scholar in the transition of Nadir Shah to Sunni Islam, and the fact that the meeting last arranged at the tomb of Imam Ali, prompted Suwaidi on the idea that Nadir Shah pointedly emphasized his preference for concern with Shiite traditions [16, p. 5]. Although it was expected that the meeting would discuss the five requirements of Nadir, were discussed, but, as the meeting showed, the main subject of discussion was the mazhab-i Jafari, during the reign of the latter, turned into a stumbling block between Sunnis and Shiites and the insoluble topic of many years of discussions between Nadir Shah and the Ottoman Empire.

Before the meeting, after meeting with Suwaydi, Nadir Shah announced that he had organized this meeting to clarify those points of religious doc-

trine and practice in Shiism that the Sunnis considered wrong, and also to make the latter accept the Shiites as brothers in Islam: "In my country in two places - Afghanistan and Turkestan, Iranians are called atheists. It is unacceptable that in my possession of one called others infidels. I make you my representative. Meet them instead of me, determine which of the parties is right and eliminate these discrepancies. You report all that you have seen and heard to me, and describe the events of Ahmed v Pasha" [16, p. 8].

According to E. Tucker, Nadir tried to use Suweidi to gain evidence from a representative of the Ottoman clergy that Iran had indeed turned to Sunni Islam [17, p. 171]. In our opinion, the true purpose of the dispensation was to eliminate the differences between a Shiite and Sunni mazhabs for at least any approval of their demands by the Sunni scholars in order to be able to exert pressure on the Ottoman government in the future.

Call Nadir Shah Najaf and came two delegations: Iran - in a chapter with Ali Akbar Mullabashi, followed by 70 people, and a delegation of Sunni clerics from Nadir conquered Central Asia and Afghanistan. Attended the meeting and scholars of Baghdad, Najaf, Hilla, Kirkuk, Karbala [4, p. 387; 15, s. 325-6; 2, s. 46]. Thus, this meeting, being a unique phenomenon for its time, represented the most obvious attempt to

achieve a comprehensive agreement between the two main areas of Islam. Only since time is the grandness of his enterprise, both in scale and in content, manifests itself more clearly.

Before the meeting Suwaydi met with Ali Akbar Mullabashi, and, according to a Shafi'i scholar, he easily refuted all arguments and quotations from Cora on and Hadith, which led to Iranian Mulla Bashi in support of Shi'ism positions [16, p. 9]. During discussions last asked to indicate why the Sunnis with Shiites are read by atheists, whereas Shiites were previously recognized as Ahl al-qibla, which meant that they were within the confines of faith [16, p. 39]. On this, the Bukhara Qazi Hadi Khoja cited four reasons: the shame of the Shiites by Abu Bakr and Omar (Sabb); the announcement of the Companions of the Prophet by the atheists; the practice of temporary marriage (mut'a), as well as recognition of the legality of channeling Shiites Ia only Hazrat Ali and the denial of the rule of law rule of the firstthree caliphs x s. But mullabashi of Sunni scholars believe that with the arrival of Nadir as the first two items are prohibited in Iran, and the temporary b cancer is considered "taboo, it will admit only so low people" [16, c. 39], as for the rule of law of the first three caliphs, then it will be recognized by Shiites from now on [16, p. 40]. But Ha di Khoja continued to insist that the vilification of the sheikhs

(Abu Bakr and Omar) is evidence of godlessness I (kufr): "According to the Hanafi Fiqh(right), vilification of caliphs is unacceptable. For him, repentance is not accepted and threatens exception m from the Muslim community. A Dzhamtso s (Iranians's) before doing a reproach sheikhs, turning in vivo Recording HS atheists. If now the Shiites and repent before being committed reproach, that they are still infidels". [16, c.40]. In response, the Afghan m ufty Mullah Hamza asked if there was any evidence that prior to the meeting some of the (present-RM.) Iranians committed "Sabbia", as it became known, they clearly rejected this practice. Agreeing with this argument, Hadi Hoja admitted that Shiite scholars present here should be considered Muslims. Dovolny such meeting outcome Nadir Shah asked the participants to meet on the following day and write down their arguments in the presence of Suveydi [16, p. 40-41].

Although Nadir requested that the discussion was devoted to the differences that exist in Sunni and Shi measurable, however, during the meeting it became clear that the latter will be more interested in a van solving legal issues, and the main argument in favor of Iranian theologians Dzhaferid Skog The mazhab consisted in the fact that the latter was designed to reduce religious differences that inflame conflict [18, p. 83].

The next day, 24 Shawwal 1156/11

December 1743 ode at the request of Na-

dir Shah, a meeting of the participants of the meeting was held again, at which four documents were prepared - "Vasigbe-name", one of which was signed by Nadir Shah himself. According to sources, the original was transferred to the sacred tomb of Imam Ali in Najaf, other copies were sent to various Muslim countries [4, p. 389; 6, s. 562; 2s. 47]. According to the text of the document compiled by munshi al-mamalik Nadir Shah Mirza Mehdi Khan Astrabadi, "vasig-name" was adopted by 41 religious figures from the Iranian side and 27 by Sunni and Shiite alim from Iraq, Maverannakhr, Afghanistan, which is confirmed by enclosed seals of religious persons. The "vasig-name" emphasized the rule of the rule of all four caliphs and the prohibition of "sabb" and "rafd": "If someone denounces Abu Bakr and Omar, may Allah bless them! - then their children and wives will be arrested, and movable and immovable property - confiscated, and the man himself - killed. The second document, signed by Iranian ulama, said about the unequivocal prohibition of "Sabb" and "Rafd". Not only representatives of the Iranian, but Shiite and Sunni clergy of Iraq, including Suwaydi, put the seals under it. The third copy of the Vasigbe-name was signed and certified by the seals of the Sunni scholars of Afghanistan, and the fourth was signed by the scientists of Central Asia. In both documents, Sunni scholars have announced the adoption of state-

ments by the Iranian Shiite clergy and the refusal to consider Iran's Shiites as godless. All these documents were stamped Mufti Bagh Dada Yasin Effendi [2, p. 47].

The method of comparison and analysis of the text of "vasigbe-name" of "Tarikh-i Nadiri" with the full text of the signed document, which we have at our disposal [2, p. 48-55], allow us to conclude that in official history the document is presented in an abbreviated form [4, p. 388-394]. Tak, in "Tarikh-i Nadiri" is missing not only the lists of religious figures of Iran and scholars of Iraq, but also the lists of scientists of Bukhara and Balkh, who expressed their agreement with the document drawn up with personal stamps. In addition, in the "Tarikh-i Nadiri" dropped not only text with the consent and a list of scientists from Afghanistan's expressing its consent, together with the texts approved by the Wali Baghdad Ahmed Pasha and the Mufti of Baghdad Yasina Efendi [2, p. 48-55; 15, 320-327].

There are discrepancies in the actual Vasigbe-name texts given by Mirza Mehdi Khan Astrabadi and Suwaydi. This can be explained, most likely, by the fact that the religious concept of Nadir had two versions: the first version that existed within the country, and the second one presented to foreign countries [1, p. 292; 17, c. 163]. In Vasigbe-name, in his essay Mirza Mehdi Khan gave the so-

called "internal, home version", made public at the coronation in Mugan, and Suweidi - "the border version". Thus, in vase-name recently indicated that the source of all the troubles in Iran YaV Iyali Safavids (implied Shah Ismail I like distributor Sabbah), and at the meeting it was decided to censure Iran ere si introduced Safavids [16, p. 42], whereas the document signed at the meeting, in the composition of Mirza Mehdi Khan blame for the spread of Shi'ite great ktik "Sabbia" and "rafd" pinned Subscribe to the "ulama Azerbaijan, Gilan and Ardebil" [4, p. 389]. In addition, the "Tarikh-Nadiri" meets convicted s Turks for what they are counting whether Iranians heretics, capture, etc. ytki and killings that were the right thing, while Suwaidi this question does not even obs Oujda. In addition, at Mirza Mehdi Khan says that because of the hatred generated by religious differences, Iranian prisoners "were selling and buying there in Europe and elsewhere," [4, p. 389; 18, p. 90]. It should be noted that in ex Ichiye from vase-name of "Tarikh-Nadiri" in the book Suv eydi no men-tion of Dzhaferid skom madhhab.

The signing of "vasigye-name" was an event of great significance for the Islamic world. For the first time in many centuries, representatives of the confrontational directions - Shiism and Sunnism came together in a single

event and in a relaxed atmosphere discussed the existing dogmatic, legal and theosophical differences. For the first time, clergymen of warring currents in a peaceful environment were looking for ways out of the current impasse that condemned the Muslims to eternal existential confrontation.

But, unfortunately, all the good wishes and motives were soon forgotten. It turned out that dogmatic differences, behind which there were quite green political interests, are essential, that it is impossible to eliminate them in principle by one meeting. Ottoman political and spiritual circles reasonably feared that behind such aspirations of Nadi ra to religious unity were his political ambitions to stand at the head of the entire Muslim world.

After signing the "vasege - n Ame" had been agreed on joint Friday prayers the next day in Kufa. However, Suweidi, dissatisfied with the outcome of the meeting, noted Nadir Shah that the only satisfactory result could be a complete transition to Sunnism. Nadir agreed with this remark, but noted that it was necessary to act in stages, and asked the Sunni scholar to lead the upcoming Friday prayer [16, p. 41]. On Friday, Suwaidi, having begun a prayer, after a while transferred the right to conduct it to Iranian Mullabashi Ali Akbar in, because it was necessary to lead the prayer, guided and Shiite and Sunni fiqh, which fur-

ther confirms the validity of the observations H. Algara about "Thu of madhhab and- Jaafari is a " hybrid: is not Shia s, but still not Sunni " [1, from. 296]. According to Ottoman sources Cove after the signing of agreements in Najaf have Suwaidi with Mullabashi Ali Akbar passed another discussion of the origins of shiits whom fiqh, the disclosure of which is not, and in the " Tarikh- Nadiri ", and in his work Suwaidi [19, p. 307].

It should be noted that in the description Suwaidi, as judges who participated in the relational igioznyh debate and signed by " vasige-name " [16, p. 42-44], there is even no mention of Jah Farid madhhab. When describing the meeting, Mirza Mehdi Khan said that the meeting was condemned by the Turks for continuing to call the Iranians heretics, and therefore justified the seizure, torture and murder of the latter and the sale and purchase of Iranian x prisoners " in Europe and other places " [4, p. 389] that, oh dna o, is absent in Suweidi [18, c. 90].

Although this issue often arose in the Iranian-Ottoman correspondence, in this case, the lack of mention of this in Suweidi suggests that at the meeting Nadir Shah, not wanting to exacerbate the situation at the meeting and pursuing his specific goals, most likely refrained from harsh rhetoric against the Turks at Suwaydi.

Thus, nesmot convent on the political motivation of the initiator of the meeting of Nadir Shah, as a result of the meeting, etc. Ishli to a specific agreement: issued the document on which the Iranians confirmed the righteousness of the first three Caliphs, gained the right to demand from the Turks column in Mecca for his madhhab, becoming co-owners of the column Shafites, while Sunni scholars from Iraq and Central Asia recognized the sacredness of Imam Jafar al-Sadig [4, c. 394; 6, s. 563-64; 9, p. 96]. As a result of the opposition of the Ottoman government, Nadir, who rejected the demands put forward, his main religious task, the realization of which would fundamentally transform the spiritual situation in the Islamic world - the restoration of Shi'ism relations with Sunni Islam - failed. However, some of the principles contained in the proposals put forward by him were nevertheless accepted by the Turkish side. The consent of the Ottoman Empire to defend the rights of Iranian pilgrims on their territory and to allocate a place at the Kaaba for the adherents Dzhafarid Skog madhhab mean official recognition of Iran as part of a single, common world, which suggests that the project of Nadir Shah can not be considered absolutely unsuccessful.

It should be noted that by the end of the XVIII century. Significant changes have occurred, and in the Shiism: the Shiite currents akhbari [iv] and [v] sharply differentiated, having devel-

oped their principles. The confrontation between these two groups ended in the victory of the latter, which was of exceptional importance for the further history of Shiism [1, p. 300].

As time has shown, the proposals of Nadir Shah, related to the transformations in religion that at one time seemed utopian, were not only not devoid of logic, but were also much ahead of their time. So, the meeting of Sunni and Shiite scientists, organized by him in 1743. in Najaf, posed the same questions as arisen in XIX c. the movement of intra-Islamic reforms, the platform of which was aimed at the political consolidation of the positions of Muslims in non-Muslim countries. The convening of international Muslim conferences in the future also had a positive impact on the Sunni-Shiite dialogue in the restoration of friendly relations between various Muslim communities [11, c. 80-1].

Already in the 20th century, intra-Muslim confessional discussions became regular. During the Muslim conferences, the Al-Azhar University Mosque in Cairo, which became the center of orthodox scholarship, acted as a forum for discussions between Sunnis and Shiites. In February 1959. historical fatwa rector of the University of Al-Azhar Sheikh Mahmoud Shaltuta (1893-1963) titled "Islam - the religion of unity", published in the Official Journal of the University of al-Azhar, allow the teaching of Shiite jurisprudence: "According to Sharia, al-

lowed to follow the provisions Dzhafarid Skog The mazhab, known as the mazhab of 12 imams, is similar to the rest of the Sunni mazhabs. Muslims need to be aware of this and refrain from manifestations of hatred and inappropriate support of a certain madhhab" [20]. This fatwa opened the door for official recognition of the Shi'a Madhab equivalent four orthodox Sung ITSC law school, which so vainly sought Nadir Shah during the whole of his reign.

Speaking with the requirements for recognition of the Islamic world Dzhafarid Skog Madhab, Nadir Shah and failed to achieve a mustache Peha in addressing this issue. AT In the 18th century, this task was not resolvable: the discrepancies between Sunni and Shi'ism, based on the attitude towards the Imamate, were so great that they could not be solved at such an early stage with the help of a proposal emanating from one person, and even dictated by clearly political considerations. By the fair definition of H. Algar, "Sunnism and Shiism represent two parallel orthodox perspectives of Islamic revelation, which cannot come together in their exoteric aspects for reasons inherent in the nature of each of them. And no politically motivated idea can change this fact, although their rapprochement at the practical and, more importantly, esoteric level is not quite possible" [1, p. 298].

But, despite the failure of the requirements of Nadir Shah to recognize the mazhab-i Jafari, depending on many political and legal reasons, the convening of a meeting of many reputable Sunni and Shiite scholars in the XVIII century. It has a great historical significance as a precedent in resolving the complex relationship between politics and theology, which for the first time touched upon the theme of restoring friendly relations within Islam. This meeting was the first trial episode that ever took place in the Muslim world, when the meeting participants came to a certain consensus, the result of which was the publication of a signed document. It is noteworthy that the idea of uniting the Muslim world (given the political goals and the ambitions of Nadir Shah) was the subject of constant efforts of the latter in the first half of

the 18th century, i.e. long before the concept of Islamic ecumenism.

[i] Sabb - public vilification of the first three caliphs during azan and Friday prayers

[ii] Rafd - denial of the rule of law of the first three caliphs

[iii] Furu'at - an offshoot of Islamic law that includes religious ordinances

[iv] Akhbarites - traditionalists who relied exclusively on legends (akhbar), written from the words of Shiite imams as the only source of religious knowledge and law (fiqh)

[v] Usulites are adherents of the legitimacy of ijtihad, understood as the process of deductive withdrawal of Islamic laws from the Quran and Sunnah. Thus, they represented the rationalist trend in Shiite Islam.

References:

1. Algar H., Shi'ism and Iran in the Eighteenth Century, Islamic History, ed. Thomas Naff and Roger Owen, Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1977, pp. 288-302
2. Ashtiyani IA, Vasiqe- I Ettihad- I Eslam Naderi, Yadegar, 4, 1326, s. 55-63
3. Asnad va mukatib -I tarikhi -I Iran-I Daura -I Afshariyye, c. 1, be kushesh -I Nasiri MR, Gilan, 1364
4. Astarabadi MMKh., Jahangosha-i Nadiri, be ehtimam-i A.Anvar, Tehran, 1377
5. M Axworthy., A History of Iran: Basic Books, Basic Books, New York, 2008, 341 p.

6. Fasa'i Husayni , Haj Mirza Hasan , Farsname-i Nasiri , be ehtemam-i MRFasa'i , c. 1, Tehran, 1382
7. Fathullahpur P., Tashayyo'ar daura-i Nadir Shah Afshar, faslname-i takhasosi-i shi'i shinasi / sal 4 / shomare 16/1385 , s. 57-95
8. Lockhart L., Nadir Shah. A Critical Study Based Mainly upon Contemporary Sources. London, Luzac & Co, 1938, 344 p.
9. Minorskiy.V., Tarikhche-i Nadir Shah, tarjome-i R.Yasemi, Tehran, Simurg, 1363
10. Muhammad Kazim Marvi , ' Alam aray -I Nadiri , be tashih-i MARIyahi , c. 2, Tehran, 1358
11. Nasr Seyyed Hossein, Dadashi Hamid , Nasr Seyyed Vali Reza, Shi'ism. Doctrines, Thoughts and Spirituality, State University of NY Press, Albany, 1988, 401 p.
12. Olson RW The Siege of Mosul and Ottoman-Persian Relations 1718-1745. The Capital of the Ottoman Empire. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1975, 237 p.
13. The Oxford History of Islam, ed. b y JLEsposito, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999, 749 p.
14. Petrov PI Ukaz Nadir shaha o pochitanii 4 pravednikh khalifof - Sb. Kratiek soobsheniya Instituta narodov Azii, t.39, Iranskiy sbornik, Moskva, 1963, s. 52-55
15. Quddusi MH Nadirname, Anjoman-i Asar-i Melli-i Khorasan, Khorasan, 1339, 724 s.
16. Süveydi Abdüllah, Hak Sözü'n Vasikaları (Bu kitabın içinde on adet risale vardır). Hucec Kati ' yye. Hakikat kitabevi, İstanbul, 2014, s. 5-45
17. Tucker E., Nadir Shah and Ja'fari Madhab Reconsidered, in Iranian Studies vol. 27, 1-4, (1994), pp. 163-79
18. Tucker E., Nadir Shah's Quest for Legitimacy in the Post-Safavid Iran, University Press of Florida, 2006, 150 p.
19. Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakki, Osmanlı tarihi, 4. cilt, 1. kısım: Karlofça Anlaşmasından XVIII. Yüzyılın sonralarına kadar, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurum Basımevi, 1978, 687 s.
20. <http://www.tebyan.net/index.aspx?pid=47963>